2004 Safe and Drug-Free Schools Report
Summary Analysis

Arizona Department of Education

**School Safety and Prevention
and
Research and Evaluation**

January 2006

Purpose and Overview
The purpose of this analysis is to summarize the data collected in the 2004 Safe and Drug-Free Schools (SDFS) Report[1]. During the 2003/2004 school year:

- Eighty-six percent of schools had a program intended to prevent or reduce violence.
- Eighty percent of schools had a formal process to obtain parent input on policies related to school safety and prevention.
- Ninety-five percent of schools enforced zero-tolerance policies for firearms, weapons and substance abuse.
- Ninety-five percent of schools had a written plan describing procedures to be performed in a crisis situation (School Safety Plan).
- Eighty-four percent of schools practiced their school safety plan at least once during the 2003/2004 school year.
- Sixty-two percent of schools had a threat assessment team in place to identify potentially violent students.
- Physical attacks without a weapon, intimidation/bullying and threats of physical attack without a weapon were the incidents most frequently reported.
- Possession of a firearm/explosive device, rape or sexual battery, robbery with a weapon and use of firearm/explosive device were the incidents least frequently reported.

Introduction
The purpose of the SDFS report is to collect data needed to meet No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) reporting requirements. The Arizona Department of Education (ADE) completes the USDOE Consolidated Report and the Gun-Free Schools Act Report annually. ADE staff use the information collected to provide technical assistance and training to school district and charter holder personnel. Data is shared with the Arizona Department of Health Services and other state agencies and will be used as a component of the 2007 School Safety Study required by Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) §15-231.03.

Design and Implementation of the Safe and Drug-free Schools (SDFS) Report
The SDFS Report is an annual census of Arizona schools developed and administered by the ADE. Some version of the SDFS Report has been implemented since 1989. It is requested of school-level administrative personnel to obtain data for state and federal reporting requirements. These requirements have changed over time and the report has changed in response. The SDFS Report is used to collect data about:

- Prevention Programs, Practices and Educational Services
- Parent Communication
- School Policies
- School Environment
- Violence and Injury at School
- Violent and Criminal Behavior at School
- Student Disciplinary Actions
- Firearms and Explosive Devices at School

---

[1] Data for this analysis was pulled on August 5, 2005 and does not include schools within accommodation districts or correctional institutions.

Data is collected on-line via the ADE website. The report is made available to schools in the Spring semester and is due June 30th of each year. Notification of the availability of the on-line application is sent to school districts and charter holders before the end of the school year. School districts and charter holders are responsible for ensuring that all schools within the district or charter submit a completed report. Schools that receive NCLB funding are required to complete the report as a condition of funding.

While school district and charter personnel are offered training each year on how to complete the report, not all districts and charters attend. The report form includes definitions for incident data, however, different interpretations on how to enter this data occur. In addition, anecdotal reports indicate some schools over-report while others under-report.

NOTES

1. The remainder of this report was compiled based on the following definitions for elementary, middle and high school.[2]

    Elementary School – Any span of grades not above Grade 6. Combined elementary/middle or combined elementary/junior high schools are considered middle schools and combined elementary and secondary schools (e.g., K-12 buildings) are classified as high schools for this report.

    Middle School – A separately organized and administered school between elementary and senior high school, which might also be called a junior high school, usually includes Grades 7, 8 and 9; Grades 7 and 8; or Grades 6, 7 and 8. Combined elementary/middle schools or combined elementary/junior high schools are considered middle schools for this report. Middle/senior high school combinations are defined as high schools.

    High School – A school offering the final years of school work necessary for graduation, usually including Grades 9, 10, 11 and 12; or Grades 10, 11 and 12. Combined elementary/high schools or combined middle school/high schools (e.g., K-12 buildings) are also classified as high schools.

2. Questions asked in the SDFS Report are included in this report for your reference.

---

[2] These definitions were adapted from the definitions provided in the U.S. Department of Education, Report on the Implementation of the Gun-Free Schools Act in the States and Outlying Areas, School Year 2000-2001, page 3.

Summary Data and Analyses

One-thousand seven-hundred and fifty-eight schools (1,758) submitted acceptable responses to the 2004 Safe and Drug-Free Schools (SDFS) Report as of August 5, 2005. Almost one million students (975,640) were in attendance at these schools during the 2003/2004 school year.

Prevention Programs, Practices and Educational Services

Q1: Did your school have a program intended to prevent or reduce violence?

A program intended to prevent or reduce violence was offered at over 86 percent (1,519) of the reporting schools.   Effective, research-validated prevention programs promote alcohol, drug, tobacco and violence-free lifestyles for youth and foster safe and drug-free schools. A strong correlation exists between safe and drug-free schools and a positive learning environment that supports academic achievement.

Table 1
(Q1) Number and Percent of Schools with
Violence Prevention or Reduction Programs by
Grade Level

Grade Level	Schools With Programs	Schools Without Programs	Percent With Programs Within Grade Level
Elementary	639	87	88.02%
Middle	484	75	86.74%
High School	396	77	84.43%
Total	1,519	239	86.41%

Q2: Which of the following education programs or services related to a safe, drug-free, or healthy school environment were offered at your school during the 2003/2004 school year?

Schools reported offering a variety of programs and services that promote a safe and drug-free school environment. The most commonly offered were Health Education, Counseling or Psychological Services, Drug Prevention Instruction, Parent Education/Involvement and Classroom Management Training. The information collected in the SDFS Report, however, does not reflect the quality or effectiveness of the programs or services offered.

<p align="center"><u>Table 2</u>
(Q2) Percent of Schools that Offer Specific Educational Programs or Services</p>

	Program	Percent Elem Schools	Percent Middle Schools	Percent High Schools	All Schools	Percent All Schools
k	Health Education	91.32%	88.17%	88.27%	1569	89.50%
g	Counseling or Psychological Services	88.71%	87.63%	79.96%	1508	86.02%
j	Drug Prevention Instruction	82.37%	88.35%	83.80%	1484	84.65%
o	Parent Education/Involvement	88.57%	85.13%	70.58%	1449	82.66%
e	Classroom Management Training	80.99%	79.93%	81.66%	1417	80.83%
m	Identification and Referral	77.41%	81.54%	80.81%	1396	79.63%
v	Violence Prevention Instruction	76.58%	78.67%	70.15%	1324	75.53%
d	Character Education	80.17%	77.06%	65.67%	1320	75.30%
a	After School Programs	79.61%	75.99%	61.41%	1290	73.59%
n	Mentoring	66.80%	72.22%	71.64%	1224	69.82%
u	Tolerance Instruction	66.67%	73.66%	67.38%	1211	69.08%
f	Community Service Programs	62.53%	69.18%	71.64%	1176	67.08%
p	Peer Mediation/Conflict Resolution	62.26%	64.52%	59.28%	1090	62.18%
s	Student Assistance Programs	59.09%	60.04%	58.64%	1039	59.27%
l	HIV Prevention Instruction	50.14%	59.86%	63.33%	995	56.76%
h	Domestic Violence/Child Abuse Training	54.96%	48.03%	46.48%	885	50.48%
b	Alternative Education Programs	34.16%	50.18%	66.10%	838	47.80%
i	Drop-out Prevention	30.72%	42.83%	75.27%	815	46.49%
q	School Based/School Linked Health Clinic	48.90%	43.01%	29.00%	731	41.70%
t	Suicide Prevention	27.13%	44.98%	55.65%	709	40.44%
c	Before School Programs	47.93%	39.96%	27.51%	700	39.93%
r	Service Learning	22.73%	35.13%	51.81%	604	34.46%

Parent Communications

Q6: Which of the following does your school do to involve parents?

Over 77 percent of the schools reported having a formal process to obtain parent input on polices related to school discipline and to inform parents of the content of the school safety plan. Parent involvement is an integral component of effective policy development and program planning. Section 4115 (a) of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Title IV-21st Century Schools, Part A-SDFS, (E)), delineates the "Principles of Effectiveness". The principles of effectiveness require schools to include meaningful and ongoing consultation with parents in the development, application and administration of programs and activities.

Table 3
(Q6) Percent of Schools that Have Formal Processes to Involve Parents

Process	Percent Elem Schools	Percent Middle Schools	Percent High Schools	All Schools	Percent All Schools
a. To obtain parent input on policies related to school discipline	80.44%	81.57%	73.15%	1,386	78.84%
f. To inform parents of the content of the school safety plan	82.37%	77.10%	71.46%	1,367	77.76%
b. To obtain parent input on policies related to violence prevention at school	69.56%	70.66%	63.85%	1,202	68.37%
c. To obtain parent input on policies related to drug prevention	64.19%	65.12%	63.42%	1,130	64.28%
d. To obtain parent input on policies related to health education	65.43%	62.79%	57.08%	1,096	62.34%
e. To obtain parent input on policies related to health services	61.98%	57.25%	49.68%	1,005	57.17%

Q7: How are parents notified about school policies?

Sending school policies home with students or reviewing policies during parent orientation meetings were the ways that schools communicated most often with parents regarding school policies. Communication with and feedback from parents regarding the development of school policies is essential to effective policy implementation.

Table 4
Percent of Schools that Practiced Specific
Parent Notification Strategies

How parents are notified about school policies	Percent Elem Schools	Percent Middle Schools	Percent High Schools	All Schools	Percent All Schools
b. Send home with students	98.35%	98.03%	90.06%	1688	96.02%
d. Parent orientation meetings	92.84%	93.02%	88.79%	1614	91.81%
a. Direct mail to home	63.22%	76.92%	86.47%	1298	73.83%
c. Post on the school website	59.92%	56.53%	60.04%	1035	58.87%
e. Other	40.63%	48.30%	49.05%	797	45.34%

School Policies

Zero-tolerance policies for firearms, weapons, substance abuse and providing a printed code of student conduct to students and parents were practiced at 95 percent or more of the schools. Ninety-nine schools (5.63 percent) required student drug testing.

The USDOE (1998) defines zero tolerance as a school or district policy that mandates predetermined consequences or punishments for specific offenses. "This type of policy is meant to convey a "tough" response that ... will deter youth from committing violations. … Although the definitions of zero tolerance and the behaviors covered by zero-tolerance policies vary widely, there is a common theme: prescribed sanctions for specified behaviors regardless of the intensity or degree of repetition of the behaviors or the circumstances surrounding them."[3]

While zero-tolerance policies are commonly practiced in schools, there is no research currently available to support the effectiveness of such policies for preventing violent behavior or drug, alcohol and tobacco use. Supporters contend that zero-tolerance policies foster a sense of safety for students and parents. Detractors criticize the same policies for promoting an "all or nothing" approach, describing zero-tolerance policies as inflexible, harsh and lacking in common sense. Zero-tolerance policies often fail to differentiate between good kids who make mistakes and juvenile delinquents who commit crimes.

Schools employ a variety of mechanisms for enforcing zero-tolerance policies. Drug testing is often used in conjunction with zero-tolerance policies for substance abuse. The effectiveness of drug-testing as an objective and reliable way of detecting and deterring drug use, however, has not been determined. Issues including the costliness of drug testing kits, false positives and alienation and resistance from students need to be considered prior to implementing a drug testing policy. The most reliable and researched-based predictors of student drug use are students' attitudes toward and peers' perception of drug use. School policies that address these predictors were shown to be effective[4].

---

[3] Kingery, Paul, M. (2002) *Zero Tolerance: The Alternative is Education*. Washington, DC: Hamilton Fish Institute available at http://hamfish.org/pub/susexp.html.

[4] Yamaguchi, Ryoko, Johnston, Lloyd D. O'Malley, Patrick M. Relationship Between Student Illicit Drug Use and School Drug-Testing Policies, Journal of School Health, April 2003, Vol. 73, No. 4, p. 159.

Table 5
Percent of Schools that Practiced Specific Policies

Policies	Percent Elem Schools	Percent Middle Schools	Percent High Schools	All Schools	Percent All Schools
j. Enforce a zero tolerance policy for Firearms	97.52%	98.03%	96.38%	1707	97.10%
i. Enforce a zero tolerance policy for Weapons	96.97%	97.31%	95.74%	1696	96.47%
f. Provide a printed code of student conduct to parents	96.14%	96.95%	97.01%	1694	96.36%
e. Provide a printed code of student conduct to students	94.35%	96.06%	96.59%	1674	95.22%
k. Enforce a zero tolerance policy for Substance Abuse	96.83%	96.24%	92.54%	1674	95.22%
m. Enforce a zero tolerance policy for Alcohol	96.42%	95.88%	91.26%	1663	94.60%
g. Enforce a zero tolerance policy for Violence	92.29%	93.01%	92.32%	1622	92.26%
l. Enforce a zero tolerance policy for Tobacco	96.14%	94.62%	84.43%	1622	92.26%
h. Enforce a zero tolerance policy for Fighting	90.50%	91.58%	89.98%	1590	90.44%
d. Close the campus for all students during lunch	87.47%	88.89%	60.34%	1414	80.43%
a. Control access to school buildings during school hours (e.g., locked doors)	81.82%	77.24%	75.69%	1380	78.50%
c. Control access to school grounds after school hours (e.g., locked gates)	81.68%	79.57%	71.00%	1370	77.93%
b. Control access to school grounds during school hours (e.g., locked gates)	76.17%	69.71%	63.75%	1241	70.59%
o. Use one or more security cameras to monitor the school	8.13%	18.46%	30.28%	304	17.29%
p. Require drug testing for any student (e.g. athletes)	1.93%	3.94%	13.43%	99	5.63%
n. Require students to pass through metal detector each day	2.20%	2.33%	4.69%	51	2.90%

Q9: Does your school have a written plan that describes procedures to be performed in a crisis situation? (Table 6)

Q10: When was the last time your school safety plan was practiced? (Table 7)

Ninety-five percent of the schools (1,676) reported having a written plan describing procedures to be performed in a crisis situation.   School safety plans were practiced at least once at 87 percent (1,470) of schools during the 2003/2004 school year.

All Arizona schools must work with local law enforcement agencies and local medical facilities to develop an emergency response plan (often called the school safety plan) that meets the minimum requirements set by the ADE and the Arizona Division of Emergency Management, per A.R.S. §15.341 (A)(34). Schools are required to practice emergency response plans or school safety plans a least once a year.

Table 6
(Q9) Percent of Schools That Have a Crisis Plan

School has a written plan of what to do in a crisis?	Percent Elem Schools	Percent Middle Schools	Percent High Schools	All Schools	Percent All Schools
Yes	98.07%	94.63%	91.97%	1676	95.34%
No	1.93%	5.37%	8.03%	82	4.66%
Total	100%	100%	100%	1758	100%

Table 7
(Q10) When School Safety Plan was Practiced

Q10. When was the last time your school safety plan was practiced?	Percent Elem Schools	Percent Middle Schools	Percent High Schools	All Schools	Percent All Schools
Within the 6 months prior to the end of this school year	75.34%	65.12%	56.66%	1179	67.06%
Between 6 and 12 months prior to end of this school year	11.98%	19.50%	20.08%	291	16.55%
Have not practiced the school safety plan yet	6.47%	10.55%	16.28%	183	10.41%
More than one year prior to end of this school year	6.20%	4.83%	6.98%	105	5.97%
Total	100%	100%	100%	1758	100%

Does your school have a threat assessment team in place to identify potentially violent students?

Sixty-two percent of the schools (1,089) have a threat assessment team in place to identify potentially violent students.

Threat assessment, as developed by the Secret Service and applied in the context of targeted school violence, is a fact-based investigative and analytical approach that focuses on what a particular student is doing and saying, not on whether the student "looks like" those who have attacked schools in the past. Threat assessment emphasizes the importance of such behavior and communication for identifying, evaluating and reducing the risks posed by a student who may be thinking about or planning a school-based attack. The USDOE and Secret Service have provided guidance for school administrators and law enforcement officials on planning and implementing a threat assessment approach within school settings.[5]

Table 8
(Q11) Percent of Schools That Have a Threat Assessment Team

A threat assessment team is in place.	Percent Elem Schools	Percent Middle Schools	Percent High Schools	All Schools	Percent All Schools
Yes	60.88%	61.72%	63.85%	1089	61.95%
No	39.12%	38.28%	36.15%	669	38.05%
Total	100%	100%	100%	1758	100%

---

[5] The Final Report and Findings of the "Safe School Initiative: Implications for the Prevention of School Attacks in the United States, Washington DC, May 2002.

Policies: Disciplinary Actions

Q12: During the 2003/2004 school year, how available were the following disciplinary actions to your school, and which were actually used by your school?

Suspension or removal for less than one year was the most common disciplinary action available to and used by schools. Twenty-two percent of the reporting schools used expulsion or removal for at least one year as a disciplinary action.

Over 80 percent (1,418) of the schools referred students to a school counselor and over 70 percent (1,235) assigned students to a program designed to reduce disciplinary problems. Thirty-three percent (585) of the schools provided community service as an alternative to suspension. Referral to law enforcement was used as a disciplinary action at 69 percent (1,211) schools.

A.R.S. 15-841 (I) requires school districts to establish an alternative-to-suspension program. Pupils who would otherwise be subject to suspension and meet the requirements of the alternative-to-suspension program shall be transferred to a location on school premises that is isolated from other pupils or transferred to a location that is not on school premises. The alternative-to-suspension program may require community service, grounds keeping, parent supervision or other appropriate activities.

Table 9
Availability and Use of Disciplinary Actions by
Number and Percent of Schools

	Available but Not Used	Available and Used	Not Available
Actions taken for disciplinary reasons:			
Removal for at least 1 year (expulsion ARS 15-840)	74.74%	21.84%	3.41%
Transfer for at least 1 year	54.32%	19.62%	26.05%
Suspension or removal for less than 1 year	26.28%	72.13%	1.59%
Provide instruction/counseling to reduce problems:			
Referral to school counselor	4.44%	80.66%	14.90%
Assigned to program designed to reduce disciplinary problems	9.50%	70.25%	20.25%
Community Service as discipline			
Require participation in community service	17.46%	43.06%	39.48%
Provide a community service option as an alternative to suspension or expulsion	22.13%	33.28%	44.60%
Law Enforcement			
Referral to law enforcement	28.95%	68.89%	2.16%

School Environment

Q15: How many paid staff at your school are in the following categories? Please include staff that perform multiple duties.

The ratio of students per professional was calculated for counselors/mental health professionals and nurses/licensed physical health professionals. The 2004 SDFS Report data indicated a student to counselors/mental health professionals ratio of 445/1. The American School Counselor Association recommends 250 students per school counselor (250/1). A comparison of these two ratios is problematic in that the SDFS data includes mental health professionals which are not included in the national recommendation.

The 2004 SDFS Report data indicated a student to nurse/licensed physical health professional of 742/1. A ratio of one nurse for every 750 students (750/1) is a goal written in Healthy People 2010[6]. While it appears Arizona schools have exceeded the national recommendation, the comparison of these ratios is also problematic. The SDFS data includes licensed physical health professionals, such as emergency medical technicians and school health aids, which are not included in the national recommendation.

Table 10
Number of Paid Staff by Title and Status and
Number of Students Per Professional

	Full Time	Part Time
a. Classroom teachers	46,379	3,240
b. Counselors/mental health professionals	1,755	879
c. Special education teachers	5,632	969
d. Nurses or licensed physical health professionals	1,075	480
e. Law enforcement officers	341	357
f. Probation officers	135	54
g. Classified staff (aides, security, clerical, support)	21,812	7,593
	77,129	13,572

---

[6] U.S. Department of Human Services, Healthy People 2010, Appendix A.

School activities were disrupted by bomb threats 62 times at 50 schools.

One elementary school reported that activities were disrupted by anthrax or other hazardous/ biochemical material threats.

Twenty-four teachers from 23 schools were removed from teaching due to criminal behavior.

Table 11
School Disruptions

	Elem Schools	Middle Schools	High Schools	Total
(Q16) How many times were school activities disrupted by bomb threats? Do not include fire alarms.	9	19	34	62
(Q17) How many times were school activities disrupted by anthrax or other hazardous/biochemical material threats?	1	0	0	1
(Q18) During the 2003-04 SY how many teachers removed due to criminal behavior?	2	8	14	24

Violence/Injury at School

Q19: Did any students, faculty, or staff die from violent causes (i.e., homicide or suicide, but not accidents)? Do not limit yourself to deaths occurring at school.

Q20 and 21: Please report violent deaths that occurred on school grounds, in school buildings, on school buses, and at places that held school sponsored events or activities. Count violent deaths, regardless of whether or not they occurred during normal school hours.

Violence was the cause of 39 student, faculty and staff deaths. Three homicides occurred on school grounds. No suicides were reported for the 2003/2004 school year. Violence can have a significant impact on students. It can affect a student's mental health, academic achievement and overall socialization and adaptation. Considering the potential impact of violence on students, emergency management plans should provide for mental health recovery.

Table 12
Number of Serious Injuries and Percent of Total Students

Questions	Elem Schools	Middle Schools	High Schools	Total	Percent of Students
Q22. How many students were seriously injured (beyond first aid) intentionally or unintentionally on school grounds?	1373	1283	596	3252	0.33%
Q23. How many students were seriously injured (beyond first aid) as a result of a violent act on school grounds?	61	134	137	332	0.03%
Q24. How many school personnel were intentionally attacked or injured by students on school grounds?	182	89	55	326	0.03%
Q25. At your school were there any incidents in which non-students used firearms with intent to harm?	2	1	4	7	0.00%

Violent/Criminal Behavior

The categories listed in question 26 represent the more serious or violent incidents that occured on school grounds. (Table 13)

Q26: Please provide the number of incidents at your school during the 2003/2004 school year using the categories below. Count all incidents, regardless of whether students or non-students were involved. Include incidents that happened at school, regardless of whether they happened during normal school hours. Enter "0" if there were no incidents in a category. If an offense does not fit well within the categories provided, do not include it. Note that the definition of a firearm/explosive device does NOT include bb guns, toy guns, cap guns, pellet guns, or firecrackers but does include 'other firearms'. Please refer to the definitions section in this report for clarification when necessary for items 'a' and 'b' below.

Physical attacks without a weapon, intimidation/bullying and threats of physical attack without a weapon were reported most often and represent over 63 percent of all reported incidents.

Student Disciplinary Actions

The selections for disciplinary action listed for question 27 are those intended for the more serious or violent incidents. (Table 14)

Q27: Please provide the number of disciplinary actions at your school during the 2003/2004 school year using the categories below. If there were no incidents or disciplinary actions in a category, enter "0". If an offense does not fit well within the categories provided, do not include it. If more than one student was involved in an incident, please count each student separately when providing the number of disciplinary actions. If a student was disciplined more than once, count each incident separately e.g., a student who was suspended five times would be counted as five suspensions. However, if a student was disciplined in two different ways for a single infraction e.g., the student was both suspended and referred to counseling, count only the most severe disciplinary action that was taken.

Table 13
(Q26) Number and Percent of Reported Incidents
(Students and Non-students)

Table 14
(Q27) Number and Total Percent of Disciplinary Actions by Incident
(Students Only)

Incidents	Number	Percent of Total Incidents	Removals (Expulsions) for at least 1 year	Transfers to Specialized Schools for at least a year	Out of School Suspensions for 10 or more days and less than 1 Year	All Other Disciplinary Actions	Row Totals	% of Total Disciplinary Actions
n. Physical attack or fight without weapon	26,979	32.71%	361	262	1,564	23,756	25,943	33.06%
k. Intimidation/bullying	17,099	20.73%	150	65	533	15,303	16,051	20.45%
p. Threats of Physical attack without a weapon	8,791	10.66%	121	35	379	7,835	8,370	10.67%
u. Vandalism	6,024	7.30%	52	31	295	4,603	4,981	6.35%
f. Possession/use of illegal drugs	5,486	6.65%	217	253	2,090	2,934	5,494	7.00%
s. Theft/larceny	4,738	5.74%	53	7	261	3,803	4,124	5.26%
t. Sexual Harassment	4,113	4.99%	58	34	175	3,655	3,922	5.00%
h. Possession/use of tobacco	2,926	3.55%	12	2	196	2,483	2,693	3.43%
d. Possession of a weapon other than a firearm/explosive device	2,332	2.83%	152	82	661	1,421	2,316	2.95%
g. Possession/use of alcohol	1,625	1.97%	42	52	577	995	1,666	2.12%
e. Distribution of illegal drugs	597	0.72%	106	86	291	138	621	0.79%
o. Threats of Physical attack with a weapon	497	0.60%	11	19	49	497	576	0.73%
m. Physical attack or fight with weapon	411	0.50%	34	23	61	670	788	1.00%
j. Hate crime	284	0.34%	12	4	34	119	169	0.22%
c. Use of a weapon other than firearm/explosive device	208	0.25%	27	18	71	186	302	0.38%
r. Robbery (taking things by force) without a weapon	188	0.23%	6	1	11	111	129	0.16%
l. Motor Vehicle Theft	87	0.11%	0	5	7	31	43	0.05%
b. Possession of a firearm/explosive device	52	0.06%	26	2	24	21	73	0.09%
i. Rape or Sexual battery	36	0.04%	3	0	45	73	121	0.15%
q. Robbery (taking things by force) with a weapon	9	0.01%	1	1	1	58	61	0.08%
a. Use of a firearm/explosive device	4	0.00%	1	0	4	24	29	0.04%
Total	82,486	100.00%	1,445	982	7,329	68,716	78,472	100.00%
Percent of all Disciplinary Actions			1.84%	1.25%	9.34%	87.57%	100.00%	

Firearms and Explosive Devices – Gun-Free Schools Act

Q28: How many students were found to have brought a firearm (Meeting the definition in 18 U.S.C. 921 (a) (3)) to school? Include all infractions meeting the definition, even if an expulsion is shortened or no penalty is imposed.

Table 15
Number and Percent of Students that Brought a Firearm to School
by Grade Level and Type of Firearm

Grades	Handguns	Rifles Shotguns	Other Firearms	Total	Percent
K-6	1	0	5	6	10.71%
7-8	7	0	7	14	25.00%
9-12	28	4	4	36	64.29%
Total	36	4	16	56	100.00%
Percent	64.29%	7.14%	28.57%	100.00%	

Q29: How many of the total incidences reported in above table were shortened to a term of less than one year by the chief administering officer for your school under the case-by-case modification provisions of 20 USC § 7151 (b) (1) of the Gun Free Schools Act?

Q30: How many of the modifications reported above were for students who are not students with disabilities as defined in 20 USC § 2302 (14) (A)?

Q31: How many of the total above resulted in a referral of the student to an alternative school or program?

Fifty-six students brought firearms to school during the 2003/2004 school year. Thirty-nine of these students were expelled from school for at least one year. Expulsions for the 17 students were modified. Only one student given a modified expulsion had a disability as defined by Section 602(a)(1) (IDEA). Twelve of the students that brought firearms to school were referred to an alternative school or program.

Conclusion

Making and maintaining safe and drug-free schools is a major challenge facing school administrators. Accurate data, provided in a timely manner, can inform and enable school administrators to tailor programs, policies and procedures to meet specific needs. The effective use of incident data contributes to the creation of schools with peaceful, orderly environments where students can learn and teachers can teach.

School Safety and Prevention Administrators with the ADE are compelled to provide the resources and technology needed to collect and compile data to support effective decision making regarding the selection, development and evaluation of school-based drug and violence prevention programs. Toward that goal the ADE applied for and was awarded a USDOE competitive grant to improve the accuracy and reliability of the incident data collected in the SDFS Report and, in turn, the quality and effectiveness of drug and violence prevention programs administered in Arizona schools.